# NOTES | March 1, 2007 Monitoring Work Group Sonoma Valley Groundwater Management Plan

The Monitoring Work Group has scheduled 3 meetings in February and March to develop a proposed monitoring program for the Basin Advisory Panel to consider at its March 22, 2007, meeting.

## Agenda Items for the Next Meeting (3/12)

- Refined draft monitoring program write up
  - Existing wells
  - o Identify new wells
  - Use GIS data to ensure wells with different depths are included
- Land Subsidence
  - What data is available
  - O How to include it in the plan?

#### **Action Items**

- Jay—Discuss confidentiality issues related to data collection and accessibility of data with attorneys
- Tim Parker—Contact Paul Shepper at RCD about potential land subsidence data

#### **Groundwater Management Plan Considerations**

Participants discussed that these considerations should be addressed in the plan:

- Standard format for data collection
- Coordinate the time of sampling and the sampling interval (time between samples) to ensure data consistency
- Data quality and how data will be verified
- Need to develop a standard way of approaching volunteers to participate in the monitoring program
- The goal is to identify existing monitoring wells and the need for additional monitoring, then apply for funding to put in additional monitoring wells
- The Plan should include a detailed list of recommendations for the monitoring program that should be prioritized. The work group urges that the plan have as much detail as possible, taking advantage of the resources currently available (consultants and active Basin Advisory Panel) and preparing the necessary information so the monitoring program can be implemented as funds become available.

## Preliminary List of Variables to Prioritize Monitoring Program Elements

During the course of the discussion, the work group participants identified variables that might serve as criteria for determining which elements of the monitoring program is highest priority either for implementation or funding. This list is not comprehensive; a full discussion on prioritization will still need to occur. This list is in no particular order.

- Screening capacity of well
- Historical data is available
- Coordinate monitoring with stream gage placement (to help understand recharge)
- Spatial coverage
- Refining the USGS model and look at areas in need
- Need for monitoring wells as opposed to production wells used for monitoring
- Quality of data
- Address issues of concern:
  - Recharge
  - Surface-ground water interaction
  - o Geothermal issues along the fault
  - Saltwater intrusion (southern portion of the Valley)

#### **Land Subsidence**

The groundwater management plan requires documentation of any data related to land subsidence due to groundwater extraction. The unavailability of data is documented in the monitoring program as a data gap. If data indicates no land subsidence has occurred as a result of groundwater extraction, then the monitoring program doesn't have to monitor the data gap. USGS and SCWA are looking at some data to address this issue.

Participants recommended that Tim Parker speak to Paul Shepper at RCD because he will likely have some information on this subject.

## **Geographic Needs—More Monitoring is Needed**

The group reviewed the location of existing monitoring wells. They identified the following areas in need of monitoring:

- Adobe Canyon
- Around Benziger
- Kenwood
- Carneros (south part of Valley)
- Hills west of Highway 12 (possible recharge area)
- "Foothills"

### **Issues that Need to be Monitored**

- Geothermal issues along the fault
- Saline intrusion
- Recharge areas
- High iron content west of Madrone Road
- Iron problems west of Sonoma Creek

#### **Possible Wells**

- California Department of Fish & Game has two wells in the south part of the Valley in Wingo area.
- Vigilante Road --granite rock (Clarence Jenkins knows of a well for potential volunteer monitoring)
- West of Highway 12 (Clarence Jenkins knows of a well for potential volunteer monitoring)

## **Other Notes**

- How many wells necessary or standard practice? 1 per 5 square miles
- Currently 54 monitoring wells; additional wells needed in other areas.
- DWR is monitoring 9 of 20 wells in its system. 9 of the 11 wells that have been taken out of service could potentially be used again. The monitoring work group thinks these wells would be a priority because of the historical data (from the 1970s) available through these wells.
- All DWR wells and all wells in the Sonoma Valley being monitored are production wells except for 3 Valley of the Moon monitoring wells. Monitoring wells provide different kinds of and higher quality data.
- The elevation of the water surface in a well as it relates to sea level shows the direction that groundwater flows.
- The depth of a monitoring is based on its function. For example, in recharge areas, the well should be shallower.

# **Participants**

Al Bandur

Nicki DeMattei

**Scott Flory** 

Norman Goldstein

Jay Jasperse

Clarence Jenkins

**Heather Kelley (SCWA GIS Presenter)** 

Krishna Kumar

John Macleod

Lisa Micheli

Vickie Mulas

**Ed Nelson** 

**Mark Nordberg** 

Tim Parker

Tito Sasaki

**Facilitator Gina Bartlett**